

## Appendix A

### Analysis of Scoping Comments

#### 4716-A Road Easement Project

Three letters specific to the project were received during the scoping period of May 27, 2016 to June 27, 2016. The three letters were analyzed and an analysis code assigned to the comments (see Table 1).

#### Comment Analysis Codes

- 1: Outside the scope of the proposed action.
- 2: Already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level of decision.
- 3: Irrelevant to the decision to be made.
- 4: Conjectural and not supported by scientific evidence.
- 5: General comment, suggestion, opinion, or position statement.
- 6: Other agency or partner's consultation, review, advice, recommendation(s), etc.
- 7: Already considered in the proposed action or is standard procedure.
- 8: Will be included in an analysis of effects to the environment.

Codes 1 – 6 are standard codes. Comments assigned to these codes are considered to be non-significant issues. Code 7 was added as a category for those suggestions that are already proposed or for procedures that are routinely done. Code 8 was added as a category for suggestions that will be analyzed for effects to the environment.

**Table 1: Comment Analysis**

Commenter	Comment	Disposition
Gary Macfarlane Friends of the Clearwater	This does not fit the CE category [36 CFR 220.6(e)(7)] under which it is proposed because there is no, "Exchanging NFS lands or interests." This is a property value, owned by all citizens of the US, that can't be given away, so cavalierly, without the opportunity for the public to comment on the impact of giving away the property right.	The project was incorrectly scoped under 36 CFR 220.6(d)(7). The corrected category is 36 CFR 220.6(e)(15). The correction does not alter the proposed action, as scoped on May 27, 2016.
	Will there be increased state use of the road under this easement?	FSR 4716-A was used by IDL previously for management purposes (permit expired in 2015), and it is expected that IDL's use of the road under the proposed easement would be similar to past use.
	Why is an easement being proposed here?	By granting the easement, the Forest Service would not have to continually process Road Use Permits, and it would facilitate the joint management of the road.

*Appendix A / Analysis of Scoping Comments / 4716-A Road Easement Project*

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Disposition</b>
Jonathan Oppenheimer and Mackenzie Case, Idaho Conservation League	We are concerned that the ... road use permits warrant additional information in the interest of soliciting meaningful input. As a result, we encourage you to provide a supplemental comment period on each of these projects to involve the public to the extent practicable.	5
	With regards to road use permits, as we have pointed out in past comments, activities approved via special use permits should be considered connected actions pursuant to NEPA.	There are no specific activities approved with the proposed issuance of the FSR 4716-A Road Easement to IDL.
	As such, the impacts associated with activities on lands administered by the Idaho Department of Lands and other entities (including but not limited to logging, road construction, application of pesticides, herbicides, and other activities) must be disclosed and analyzed prior to approval of the Road Use Permit by the Forest Service	There are no specific activities approved with the proposed issuance of the FSR 4716-A Road Easement to IDL.
	Impacts to these resources could warrant the development of an EA or an EIS, however it is impossible to know based on the lack of information provided in the scoping notice.	We have determined no extraordinary circumstances exist (36 CFR 220.6), and therefore the use of a CE is appropriate for each project.
	Analyses for each project should consider how the project is consistent with various management directions, including but not limited to the Endangered Species Act, Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forest Plans, Clean Water Act and any other relevant laws and agency direction.	This is standard procedure.
Daniel Stewart Idaho Dept. of Env. Quality	Project activities may affect the NP-CW NF's ability to achieve flow based on pollutant allocation reduction associated with Forest land or management activities.	3
	Projects initiated after the establishment of TMDL pollutant load allocations can adversely affect water quality through a reduction in load capacity.	3